

Remarks

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 18, 2007. By this amendment, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-35 and added new claims 36-70. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Applicants do not admit that these amendments were necessary as a result of any cited art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above application in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Of Claims 1 And 3-12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) As Being Anticipated By Everhart et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,240,347

Claims 1 and 3-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Everhart et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,240,347. Claims 1 and 3-12 have been canceled and replaced by new claims 36-70. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection because *Everhart et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest features of the pending claims.

For instance, *Everhart et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest claims 36-40 which recites, *inter alia*, "a prompting component adapted to prompt the vehicle occupant to input information . . . for specifying a particular vehicle parameter for the communications mode if additional information is needed than the information contained in the voice command."

As noted, by the Examiner, *Everhart et al.* fails to disclose "a prompting component for prompting the vehicle occupant to input information specifying a vehicle parameter for which information in the voice command was not provided." (See Office Action, mailed May 18, 2007, p. 5, § 5, second paragraph.) For at least these reasons, claim 36 is patentable in light of *Everhart et al.* and the other references of record. Further, claims 37-48 depending from claim 36 are patentable for the above stated reason, as well as their own limitations.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection because *Everhart et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest features of pending claims 49-58. For instance,

Everhart et al. fails to teach, disclose or suggest amended claim 45 which recites, *inter alia*, "a prompting component adapted to prompt the vehicle occupant to input information . . . for specifying a particular vehicle parameter for the communications mode if additional information is needed than the information contained in the voice command."

As noted, by the Examiner, *Everhart et al.* fails to disclose "a prompting component for prompting the vehicle occupant to input information specifying a vehicle parameter for which information in the voice command was not provided." (See Office Action, mailed May 18, 2007, p. 5, § 5, second paragraph.) For at least these reasons, claim 49 is patentable in light of *Everhart et al.* and the other references of record. Further, claims 50-58 depending from claim 49 are patentable for the above stated reason, as well as their own limitations.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection because *Everhart et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest features of pending claims 59-70. For instance, *Everhart et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest amended claim 59 which recites, *inter alia*, "a prompting component adapted to prompt the vehicle occupant to input information . . . for specifying a particular vehicle parameter for the communications mode if additional information is needed than the information contained in the voice command."

As noted, by the Examiner, *Everhart et al.* fails to disclose "a prompting component for prompting the vehicle occupant to input information specifying a vehicle parameter for which information in the voice command was not provided." (See Office Action, mailed May 18, 2007, p. 5, § 5, second paragraph.) For at least these reasons, claim 59 is patentable in light of *Everhart et al.* and the other references of record. Further, claims 60-70 depending from claim 59 are patentable for the above stated reason, as well as their own limitations.

**Rejection Of Claims 2 And 13-35 Are Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
As Being Unpatentable Over Everhart et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,240,347
In View Of Stammle et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,839,670**

Claims 2 and 13-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Everhart et al.* in view of *Stammler et al.* Claims 2 and 13-35 have been canceled and replaced by new claims 36-70. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection because the proposed combination fails to teach, disclose or suggest features of the pending claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection because the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest features of new claims 36-48. For instance, the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest claim 36, which recites *inter alia*, "a prompting component adapted to prompt the vehicle occupant in audio to input information . . . to disambiguate between a plurality of matching data by prompting the vehicle occupant to select a particular set of data from the matching data while in the communications mode."

While *Stammler et al.* may teach a speech dialog system (SDS) with a speech-controlled telephone control (see col. 12, ll. 41-43), the SDS does not take into account matching data and prompting the vehicle occupant to select a particular set of data from the matching data while in the communications mode as presently claimed. At best, *Stammler et al.* teaches that the SDS determines whether a name input has occurred, whether the name is recognized correctly, whether the number input is completed, whether the number is confirmed and other operations such as dialing, deleting, forwarding and a desire to correct numbers (col. 13, ll. 46 to col. 14, ll. 19, see also Figures 9-10). *Everhart et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Stammler et al.* For at least these reasons, claim 36 is patentable in light of the combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.*, and the other references of record. Further claims 37-48 depending from claim 36, are patentable for the above stated reasons as well as their own limitations.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection because the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest features of new claims 49-58. For instance, the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and

Stammler et al. fails to teach, disclose or suggest claim 49, which recites *inter alia*, "a prompting component adapted to prompt the vehicle occupant in audio to input information . . . to disambiguate between a plurality of matching data by prompting the vehicle occupant to select a particular set of data from the matching data while in the communications mode."

While *Stammler et al.* may teach a speech dialog system (SDS) with a speech-controlled telephone control (see col. 12, ll. 41-43), the SDS does not take into account matching data and prompting the vehicle occupant to select a particular set of data from the matching data while in the communications mode as presently claimed. At best, *Stammler et al.* teaches that the SDS determines whether a name input has occurred, whether the name is recognized correctly, whether the number input is completed, whether the number is confirmed and other operations such as dialing, deleting, forwarding and a desire to correct numbers (col. 13, ll. 46 to col. 14, ll. 19, see also Figures 9-10). *Everhart et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Stammler et al.* For at least these reasons, claim 49 is patentable in light of the combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.*, and the other references of record. Further claims 50-58 depending from claim 49, are patentable for the above stated reasons as well as their own limitations.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection because the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest features of new claims 59-70. For instance, the proposed combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.* fails to teach, disclose or suggest claim 59, which recites *inter alia*, "a prompting component adapted to prompt the vehicle occupant in audio to input information . . . to disambiguate between a plurality of matching data by prompting the vehicle occupant to select a particular set of data from the matching data while in the communications mode."

While *Stammler et al.* may teach a speech dialog system (SDS) with a speech-controlled telephone control (see col. 12, ll. 41-43), the SDS does not take into account matching data and prompting the vehicle occupant to select a particular set of data from the matching data while in the communications mode as presently claimed. At best, *Stammler et*

al. teaches that the SDS determines whether a name input has occurred, whether the name is recognized correctly, whether the number input is completed, whether the number is confirmed and other operations such as dialing, deleting, forwarding and a desire to correct numbers (col. 13, ll. 46 to col. 14, ll. 19, see also Figures 9-10). *Everhart et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Stammler et al.* For at least these reasons, claim 59 is patentable in light of the combination of *Everhart et al.* and *Stammler et al.*, and the other references of record. Further claims 60-70 depending from claim 59, are patentable for the above stated reasons as well as their own limitations.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that the Office Action mailed May 18, 2007 has been fully responded to. Consequently, in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which allowance is respectfully requested.

The Petition fee of \$120.00 is being submitted herewith electronically, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

KRISHNASWAMY VENKATESH PRASAD

By /Martin J. Sultana/

Martin J. Sultana

Reg. No. 57,739

Attorney for Applicants

Dated: September 17, 2007

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400; Fax: 248-358-3351